

CITY OF SAN BRUNO

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT



567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066
Voice: (650) 616-7074
Fax: (650) 873-6749

<http://www.ci.sanbruno.ca.us>

STAFF

George D. Foscardo, AICP,
Community Development Director
Grant Wilson, AICP, *Associate Planner*
Steve Padovan, AICP, *Associate Planner*
Jonathan P. Lowell, *City Attorney*

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Terry Birt, *Chair*
Mary L. Johnson, *Vice-Chair*
Bob Marshall Jr.
Perry Petersen
Joe Sammut

**CITY OF SAN BRUNO
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
567 EL CAMINO REAL
September 19, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by **Chair Birt**.

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Marshall, Commissioner Sammut, Commissioner Schindler, Commissioner Petersen, Commissioner Tobin, Vice Chair Johnson and Chair Birt

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Division: Steve Padovan, Associate Planner
Grant Wilson, Associate Planner
Tanya Sullins, Recording Secretary
City Attorney: Jonathan Lowell

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MEETING OF August 15, 2000

Motion Petersen / Second Tobin to approve the minutes with changes.

2. COMMUNICATIONS

None

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Gary Fleming from the public came to speak about the update of the general plan, and submitted a letter to the commission.

Audrey Leon would like to see a moratorium on any rezoning until the General Plan has been updated.

4. 3300 College Drive - (Tape File 407-A)

Request for a Parcel Map to create a 22 acre parcel at the east end of the Skyline College property bordered by College Drive, the perimeter campus road and the homes off Fasman and Elston Drives and to Rezone the entire Skyline College site including the new parcel from Open Space and Conservation (O) to Single-Family Residential (R-1); per Chapters 12.136 and 12.32 of the San Bruno City Code - San Mateo Community College District.

Associate Planner Padovan stated that the staff report is the same, except for an additional statute that was found in the planning zoning development laws. It states that zoning on unused school sites can not be restricted, and has to allow schools to sell property at maximum value. Open space zoning adjacent to single family homes cannot be imposed if it restricts the value of school property, or a school's ability to sell it at its highest value. **Chair Birt** asked if the Commissioners that were missing from August 15th's Planning Commission had the opportunity to review the minutes or the tapes. All indicated that they had reviewed the record and were prepared to make a decision. **Chair Birt** asked **City Attorney Lowell** if the public hearing was closed for tonight. **City Attorney Lowell** replied that he recommends against reopening, since there may be people who are not present based on the decision that it was closed at the last meeting. The only exception is if someone from the public wants to comment on the specific code section that Staff just brought to the Planning Commission's attention. **Chair Birt** asked if the Commission can ask the applicant questions for clarification. **City Attorney Lowell** said that would be acceptable. **Commissioner Tobin** stated that there was a notice of public hearing that read on August 15th and September 19th public hearing was to be opened and closed, and wanted clarification since the public may have understood from the previous notice that they would have the opportunity to speak. **City Attorney Lowell** wanted to correct that and let the public know that public hearing was closed, and that any notice to the contrary was in error, but the ultimate decision was up to the Commission.

Commissioner Petersen motioned to re-open the public hearing specifically for anyone who wants to address Government Code 65852.9, **Commissioner Tobin** second. All Commissioners in favor.

Public Hearing Opened

Mr. Zelnick stated that San Bruno is being over developed, and with a plan that is not updated is not properly controlling the development. He wants the Planning Commission to stand up for the residents. **Elizabeth Biggs** stated that although we can not restrict the zoning, that is a small part of the problem, and asked are preparations for an easement already in place as stated on page 4 of the staff report. **Mr. Fleming** sees the **Planning Commission** as a political body, who can support the citizens if they want to, and he would like to see that happen. **Jim Menard** wanted clarification on the no impact on the re-zoning. He had concerns of the rapid growth in **San Bruno**, and the road safety issues that go along with the rapid growth. He also stated that this project was not well thought out, and implicated that the deaths on the highway are because of the new developments in the area. **Paul Ramsey** wanted to reiterate how the City of San Bruno has had the most re-developmental impact with the Airport and the County Jail facilities. He also shared his concerns of the mass development or growth in San Bruno and the effect this will have on the environment and road safety.

Public Hearing Closed

Commissioner Marshall asked what Skyline College would be able to do with the land right now without any approval from the planning commission. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that since they are a state entity, and if it is a school related use, they can do what they want no matter what the zoning is for that area. Although they would still have to go through the Environmental Process, it would be a state process. They would not go through the City of San Bruno for any approval. **Chair Birt** questioned why staff wants the entire acreage to be re-zoned to R-1. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated it was because it was a subdivision of land. **Chair Birt** stated that it seemed like the Planning Commission doesn't really have a choice in this situation. Can they put any restrictions on the potential use of the land, or do we have to wait until someone actually comes in with a proposal. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that what Staff has done is look at the laws, and in their best

opinion feel that the laws indicate that this is the correct process to go through. **Commissoner Sammut** wanted to clarify the process. Laguna Salada School District has agreed to sell to the San Mateo unified college district, the Pacific Heights Elementary School. In order for the college to pay for that, they need to sell this parcel of land. If we agree or decide not to rezone it, and City Council agrees not to rezone it, and at that point the deal with Laguna Salada is off. They would then begin the process of building on this parcel without our approval. Then Pacific Heights would be sold to the highest bidder, possibly having single family homes built on it. The Pacific Heights School is an ideal location for the college since it is already set up for the same use. At least the way staff is currently proposing it sounds like the Planning Commission will at least have a say in what is going to be built in that area. It almost sounds like if this doesn't go through the City would be in a worse situation than we are in now. Because the college is going to build what they need anyhow, and they lose out on the opportunity to buy a school site that is already put together for them. **Commissioner Schinder** stated that after reading through the documents from Staff, if this request is turned down, the college can turn around and go to the state, and the state has codes allowing the use of that property to its boundaries. We can spend all this time and make everyone happy by turning it down, and the school can get it reversed by the State. **Commissioner Tobin** stated that although this is a tough decision, based on the few hundred signatures of residents who are against this, although we are only supposed to be looking at the negative declaration, it is inevitable to look at what is going to happen. And he is not in favor of this as it stands. **Commissioner Sammut** stated that it does not make sense to close off the college district from the opportunity to buy a piece of property that is already set up and ready for them to use. Because if it doesn't happen, they will build on the open space, the Pacific Heights being zoned R-1 already will be sold to a residential developer. It doesn't make sense to force that issue when we can control what is going to happen on Skyline Blvd. **Commissioner Petersen** asked the question if the Commission were to vote a resolution not to go ahead with this rezoning the matter would still go to the City Council. **City Attorney Lowell** stated that whatever the Planning Commission decides the next step is still to go to the City Council. **Commissioner Petersen** stated that it can be voted to approve or deny, and the next step is to go to the City Council. The public can go to the City Council meeting. The only matter before the Planning Commission is just the re-zoning of this parcel of land. **Commissioner Petersen** asked if the college would like to build residential housing for students in that area, there is nothing to prohibit them from doing that. **City Attorney Lowell** stated that since it is a college related use, they would be permitted to do that on their own without the City's review. **Vice-Chair Johnson** stated that it is a clear situation, and the Planning Commission doesn't really have an option, since the General Plan supersedes the Zoning Map. **City Attorney Lowell** confirmed that where there is a discrepancy between the two, the state law directs the city to bring the zoning into conformance with the General Plan. **Vice-Chair Johnson** stated that she wants to do what is legally required. **Commissioner Marshall** stated that upon reviewing the site he ran into neighbors who were concerned about the view that they are currently enjoying. But he explained to the residents that if it wasn't two story residential homes, it could be 3 story school buildings which would be worse, and a residential neighborhood could be controlled by the Planning Commission, where the school buildings would not. At the **Laguna Salada** they stated that they would keep the baseball field open for city use. There are ways where we could get a city park in the development. He feels that the residential neighborhood is a better use of the land. **Commissioner Tobin** stated that he wants to question the validity of the General Plan. They do not conform to today's needs. To vote in favor of the rezoning would be a bad decision. **Commissioner Petersen** stated that even if the General Plan were amended and changed this to open space, the school district would still have the ability to sub-divide this parcel and sell part of it. **City Attorney Lowell** stated that is what they are doing now, under the current General Plan. If the school were to seek to develop some of the parts of the site, those too could be under state law allowed to utilize the space in the same manner as the surrounding properties. **Chair Birt** asked **City Attorney Lowell** that we have 2 issues, the 20 parcels regarding the R-1 zoning, and the entire acreage. If we are to look at the entire acreage, we would want to consider that when the City rewrites the General Plan. **City Attorney Lowell** stated that the college site and other educational sites are permitted uses in R-1 zones. But there are statutes on the books that direct the city to designate those sites consistent with the General Plan and neighboring uses. The General Plan may be amended in the future to provide for different uses in the area such that R-1 zoning may not be the only zoning applicable to a neighboring school site. For example, the General Plan could call for planned developments in the area and the zoning changed to reflect planned development zones. **Chair Birt** states that she is concerned with making decisions based on an outdated General Plan. Commissioner Petersen

noted again that any decision that the Planning Commission makes will go to the City Council next.

Motion Petersen/ Second Schindler to not approve the rezoning and parcel map. Failed to pass 3 - 4. **Commissioner Marshall, Vice-Chair Johnson, Commissioner Sammut, and Commissioner Schindler** opposed.

Motion Sammut/ Second Marshall to approve staff' recommendation. Approved by voice vote 4 to 3. **Commissioner Tobin, Commissioner Petersen, and Chair Birt** opposed.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, July 22, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the site on July 20, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The Zone Change to rezone the entire Skyline College site including the new parcel from Open Space and Conservation (O) to Single-Family Residential (R-1) is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Element and State Planning Zoning and Development Laws. The campus site is designated low density residential and the rezone to R-1 will make it consistent with the General Plan. These designations are consistent with the college use and the uses currently surrounding the site.
5. The Zone Change is consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance which provides for zoning map amendments and the college use will remain a conditional use in the R-1 zone, so public review will be retained. The new parcel conforms to all the minimum requirements established for the R-1 Zone.
6. A Negative Declaration was prepared for the project in accordance with the provisions of CEQA, as amended. It was determined that no significant impacts would result from the proposal.
7. The request for a Parcel Map to create a 22 acre parcel at the east end of the Skyline College property bordered by College Drive, the perimeter campus road and the homes off Fasman and Elston Drives and to Rezone the entire Skyline College site including the new parcel from Open Space and Conservation (O) to Single-Family Residential (R-1) at 3300 College Drive will not be adverse to the public health, safety or general welfare of the community nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements. The existing use conforms to the existing nature of the R-1 zone district and there are residential uses surrounding the site. There are no adverse impacts as a result of this project. Any potential impacts from the development of the site in the future will be reviewed and mitigated when that proposal is presented to the City.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Parcel Map PM-00-01 shall not be valid for any purpose. The Parcel Map will expire within two years if a final map has not been recorded.
2. Establish and record an access easement for College Drive from the campus ring road east to Sheryl and Allen Drives to provide access to the parcel.

3. A final map shall be submitted showing all easements to be dedicated for public access, public utilities and infrastructure improvements.
4. Establish and record utility easements for all private utilities within the new parcel.
5. Obtain encroachment permit if construction is needed.
6. Identify all existing utilities on the site and provide easements.

(Chairperson Birt advised of the seven day appeal period).

5. 2816 Fleetwood Drive - (Tape File 406-A)

Request for a Use Permit to construct a 1,587 square foot, two-story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a two car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area and a second story with a window facing an interior side yard on an abutting property greater than 10 feet; per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 12.200.040.B.1 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - Al Baba, applicant/owner.

Associate Planner Padovan entered staff report dated September 19, 2000, into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Public Hearing opened

Applicant **Al Baba** was present to answer questions. **Commissioner Marshall** asked applicant to add a second window to make the appearance of the home more symmetrical. Applicant said that it would be no problem to put a window there. **Vice-Chair Johnson** asked applicant if there will be any changes of the entry way to the home, since it was difficult to determine where the front door is to the home. Applicant stated that he was going to take down the existing fence to make the front open to the street. **Commissioner Schindler** asked if the applicant had planned on repainting the home. Applicant stated that the house would be repainted.

Public Hearing closed.

Motion Tobin / Second Sammut to approve Use Permit 00-25 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-7) and Conditions of Approval (1-14). Approved by unanimous voice vote

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 9, 2000 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 7, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorical Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 1,587 square foot, two-story addition to an existing single

family dwelling with a two car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area and a second story with a window facing an interior side yard on an abutting property greater than 10 feet at 2816 Fleetwood Drive will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use because the addition will blend well with the existing home as well as those surrounding, there is adequate parking provided and the use is consistent with surrounding residential uses.

6. The new addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the proposal is consistent with the size and scale of the surrounding neighborhood and the design, architecture, and materials will match the existing structure.
7. The proposal for an expanded single-family home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 00-25 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 00-25 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 1,587 square foot, two-story addition to an existing single family dwelling with a two car garage that will result in a greater than 50% expansion to the existing gross floor area and a second story with a window facing an interior side yard on an abutting property greater than 10 feet at 2816 Fleetwood Drive shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit.
No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
6. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
7. Prior to final inspection, the windows, trim, roof material, and exterior finish and color on the addition and existing structure shall match.
8. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
9. Install a new sanitary sewer clean out at the property line per City requirements.
10. Remove and replace all broken sidewalk, driveway, curb and gutter. Any unused existing driveway shall be removed and replaced with sidewalk, curb and gutter per City standard.

11. Obtain an Encroachment Permit and pay applicable fees for any construction on the City right-of-way including work on the driveway, sidewalk, curb and gutter and on City utilities including water (domestic, irrigation and fire), sewer and storm water piping.
12. All storm water from the new addition roof shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system through a curb drain to the gutter. No water shall be allowed to drain over the driveway or sidewalk or onto any adjoining property.
13. Notes shall be placed on the building plans indicating that the entire roof shall be replaced and the entire house repainted prior to final building inspection.
14. *A second window shall be included on the front (south) elevation to match the style and size of the window shown on said elevation. - Per Commissioner Marshall.*

(Chairperson Birt advised of the seven day appeal period).

6. 468 Linden Avenue - (Tape File 407-B)

Request for a Use Permit to construct a 406 square foot addition to a single- family house with no covered parking and the inclusion of a parking pad; a request for a Minor Modification for side yard setbacks of 3'-3"N and 3'S; per Sections 12.200.080.A.1 and 12.120.010.B of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - Brandon and Christine Corey, applicant/owner.

Associate Planner Padovan entered staff report dated September 19, 2000. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Commissioner Tobin asked staff how the curb cut out would be for this residence. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that it would be at a 90 degree angle to the street.

Public Hearing opened.

Applicant and owner **Brandon Corey** was present. **Commissioner Tobin** asked the applicant on conditions of approval # 7, which exterior finish will be applied to the home. Applicant stated that they will be using the wood siding throughout most of the house.

Public Hearing closed.

Motion Johnson / Second Schindler to approve Use Permit 00-26 and Minor Modification 00-04 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-9) and Conditions of Approval (1-17). Approved by unanimous voice vote.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 9, 2000 and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 7, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

5. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 406 square foot addition to a single-family dwelling with no covered parking and the inclusion of a parking pad and a request for a Minor Modification Permit for three (3) foot side yard setbacks where five (5) feet are required at 468 Linden Avenue will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use because the addition will blend well with the existing home as well as those surrounding, there is adequate parking provided and the use is consistent with surrounding residential uses.
6. The new addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the proposal is consistent with the size and scale of the surrounding neighborhood and the design, architecture, and materials will match the existing structure.
7. The proposal for an expanded single-family home is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
8. The project is in conformance with the San Bruno Redevelopment Project Area Plan, dated July 1999.
9. The general appearance of the proposed building is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to adjacent real property because there are existing buildings in the area with similar reductions in setbacks.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 00-26 and Minor Modification 00-04 shall not be valid for any purpose. These permits shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The request for a Use Permit to construct a 406 square foot addition to a single-family dwelling with no covered parking and the inclusion of a parking pad and a request for a Minor Modification Permit for three (3) foot side yard setbacks where five (5) feet are required at 468 Linden Avenue shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2000 labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit.
No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
6. The garage shall be used for storage or laundry facilities and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for revocation of this permit.
7. Prior to final inspection, the windows, trim, roof material, and exterior finish and color on the entire structure shall match.

8. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
9. Install a new sanitary sewer clean out at the property line per City requirements.
10. Remove and replace all broken sidewalk, driveway, curb and gutter.
11. Obtain an Encroachment Permit and pay applicable fees for any construction on the City right-of-way including work on the driveway, sidewalk, curb and gutter and on City utilities including water (domestic, irrigation and fire), sewer and storm water piping.
12. All storm water from the new addition roof shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system through a curb drain to the gutter. No water shall be allowed to drain over the driveway or sidewalk or onto any adjoining property.
13. Submit a current title report to the City for review. Show the property lines and easements on the plans. Building shall not encroach onto any easements.
14. Provide light and ventilation in the kitchen.
15. Provide emergency egress and natural light and ventilation in the office/bedroom.
16. The parking pad shall be constructed of decorative pavement stones, cobbles or decorative concrete.
17. The exterior materials shall be consistent with the option of stucco in the entryway if siding is proposed.

(Chairperson Birt advised of the seven day appeal period).

7. 144 Elm Avenue - (Tape File 407- B)

Request for a use permit to construct a 480 square foot two-story addition which results in a living area exceeding 1,825 square feet with a one-car garage and results in a floor area ratio of .74 where .55 is the maximum allowed; per Sections 12.200.080.A.1& 2; 12.200.030.A.1; and 12.200.050 B.1&2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - **Steven J. Bosso**, applicant/ owner.

Associate Planner Wilson entered staff report dated September 19, 2000 into the record. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Public Hearing opened.

Applicant **Steven Bosso** present for questions.

Public hearing closed.

Motion Tobin / Second Johnson to approve UP-00-24 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-7) and Conditions of Approval (1-12). Approved by unanimous voice vote.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 9, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 7, 2000.

2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The use permit request to construct a 480 square foot two-story addition which exceeds 1,825 sq. feet of living space for a one car garage and results in a floor area ratio of .74 where .55 is the maximum allowed on 144 Elm Ave. will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with all setback, height, floor area, and lot coverage requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.
6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.
7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-24 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-24 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. Request for a use permit to construct a 480 square foot two-story addition which exceeds 1,825 sq. feet of living space for a one car garage and results in a floor area ratio of .74 where .55 is the maximum allowed shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2000, labeled Exhibit "B," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. Remove and replace all broken sidewalk, driveway, curb and gutter. Any unused existing driveway shall be removed and replaced with sidewalk, curb, and gutter per City standard.
6. Obtain an Encroachment Permit and pay applicable fees for any construction on the City right-of-way including water (domestic, irrigation, and fire), sewer and storm water piping.
7. All storm water from new addition roof shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system of through a curb drain to the gutter. No water shall be allowed to drain over the driveway or sidewalk or onto any adjoining property.

8. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
9. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
10. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
11. The addition shall use exterior building materials which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
12. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.

(Chairperson Birt advised of the seven day appeal period).

8. 517 Chestnut Avenue - (Tape File 407- B)

Request for a use permit to allow construction of a new addition that results in total living area of 2035 square feet with a single-car garage where the maximum living area allowed is 1825 square feet; per Section 12.200.080.A.2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - **Monique Duval**, applicant/owner.

Associate Planner Wilson entered the staff report dated September 19, 2000. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Open Public Comment

Commissioner Tobin wanted to know if the Redwood Tree will be replaced. Homeowner stated that was her intention.

Closed Public Comment

Motion Johnson / Second Schindler to approve UP-00-27 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-9) and Conditions of Approval (1-18). Approved by unanimous voice vote.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 9, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 7, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The use permit request to construct a 499 square foot addition to the single-family home at 517 Chestnut Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with all setback, height, floor area ratio, and lot coverage requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.

6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.

7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.

8. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

9. The house as proposed will be similar in size to many others in the neighborhood that have single-car garages and the street frontage of the property is adequate to accommodate two cars on the street directly in front of the subject property.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-27 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-27 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The proposed addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2000, labeled Exhibit "A," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.

3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.

4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.

5. Install new sanitary sewer clean-out at property line per City standard.

6. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.

7. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.

8. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.

9. Exterior entry doors (including pedestrian garage entry door) on the house are to be metal or 1-3/4" solid core wood with a deadbolt lock with a bolt throw of at least one inch. The front door must have a 190 degree peep viewer unless there are vision panels in or around the door.

10. Any windows in or adjacent to the front door and within reach (40") of the door locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.

11. If any French doors are installed, the inactive leaf must have floor and ceiling extension bolts of at least 3/4" throw.

12. The addition shall use exterior building materials which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
 13. The designer shall ensure that the existing water service is sufficient for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculation to the City of San Bruno Public Works Department for review if upsizing is necessary.
 14. The homeowner shall ensure that the existing sewer service is adequate to handle the additional bathrooms as planned.
 15. Storm water from the new addition roof downspout shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through a curb drain to the gutter.
 16. Remove and replace all broken sidewalk, driveway, curb and gutter.
 17. Obtain an encroachment permit and pay applicable fees for any construction on the City right-of-way including work on the driveway, sidewalk, curb, and gutter and on City utilities including water (domestic, irrigation, and fire), sewer and stormwater piping.
 18. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.
- (Chairperson Birt advised of the seven day appeal period).

8. 411 Madison Street - (Tape File 407- B)

Request for a conditional use permit to allow the construction of a single family residential addition that would result in a lot coverage of 2896 square feet where the maximum allowed is 2769 square feet and would be greater than 50% addition to existing total floor area; per Sections 12.200.030.B and 12.200.050.A of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance - **Betty Blanchard**, applicant/owner; UP-00-28.

Associate Planner Wilson entered the staff report dated September 19, 2000. A digital photo presentation was provided.

Chair Birt asked if there is a condition to have the house repainted. **Associate Planner Wilson** stated that condition could be added.

Open Public Comment

Ken Ibarra, Architect, was present to answer questions. **Commissioner Marshall** asked if there was a wall or partial wall between the master bedroom and living area. **Ken Ibarra** stated that it is all one room. **Commissioner Sammut** stated that he wanted to make sure the homeowner understood that the paint issue is to make sure the paint is to match the rest of the home. Homeowner stated that there are no problems with any of the conditions.

Close Public Comment

Motion Johnson / Second Sammut UP-00-28 subject to the attached Findings of Fact (1-8) and Conditions of Approval (1-20).

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by legal notice published in the San Bruno Herald, Saturday, September 9, 2000, and notice mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on September 7, 2000.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.

3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorical Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The use permit request to construct a 1175 square foot addition to the single-family home at 411 Madison Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to the property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition complies with all setback, height, and floor area ratio requirements of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance.
6. The general appearance of the residential addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the architectural design and materials will match the existing structure as closely as possible.
7. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
8. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Summary of Hearing" to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, UP-00-28 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-00-28 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The proposed addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2000 labeled Exhibit "A," except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Director of Planning and Building.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
5. Install new sanitary sewer clean-out at property line per City standard.
6. The residence, garage, and addition shall be used only as a single family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence or garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. Address numbers must be at least four inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
8. Sliding doors and windows which are accessible from the ground (or on a balcony) must have lift out resisting hardware and secondary locks.
9. Exterior entry doors (including pedestrian garage entry door) on the house are to be metal or 1-3/4" solid core wood with a deadbolt lock with a bolt throw of at least one inch. The front door must have a 190 degree

peep viewer unless there are vision panels in or around the door.

10. Any windows in or adjacent to the front door and within reach (40") of the door locking device are to have burglary resistant glazing or be equivalently resistant.
11. If any French doors are installed, the inactive leaf must have floor and ceiling extension bolts of at least 3/4" throw.
12. The addition shall use exterior building materials which are compatible with the existing residence as indicated on the plans.
13. The designer shall ensure that the existing water service is sufficient for the new addition. Submit hydraulic calculation to the City of San Bruno Public Works Department for review if upsizing is necessary.
14. The homeowner shall ensure that the existing sewer service is adequate to handle the additional bathrooms as planned.
15. The garage shall be used for the storage of vehicles. No part of the garage shall be used as living space.
16. Provide landing at exterior door of new bedroom.
17. Show the easements on the plans for review by Public Works Engineering. The addition and retaining wall shall not encroach onto the easements.
18. Provide the Public Works Department (Engineering) with a soils report and obtain a grading permit for grading work in excess of fifty cubic yards of total excavation and fill.
19. Remove and replace all broken sidewalk, driveway, curb, and gutter.
20. All storm water from the new addition roof shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through a curb drain to the gutter. No water shall be allowed to drain over the driveway or sidewalk or onto any adjoining property.
21. *House is to be repainted - added per Chair Birt*

SPECIFIC PLAN STUDY SESSION

Associate Planner Padovan gave an update on the draft document from consultant, who is currently making some changes to policy statements and objectives. Staff should have a draft document by October 3rd ready for the public, and start the 45 day review period for the public to comment on, and have a final EIR ready for the Planning Commission by the end of that review period, and to city council for final adoption. The sale of the property is still on for October 26th. Nothing will be developed until December of 2001 when the Navy actually leaves. Staff currently has a request into CalTrans on modifications of the intersection at El Camino. Navy site has open house from 9 - 12 every Thursday until the day of the bid. **Commissioner Petersen** asked about the possibility of the new off-ramp off of 380, and wanted to know if that has been discussed further. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that a proposal has not been processed for this type of a project. It would take years to study a project like this. **Commissioner Petersen** stated that the traffic west bound from 380 is getting more congested. **Commissioner Tobin** asked staff if the Marines will remain after the Navy has moved. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that they will be remaining indefinitely. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that there was a comment from the public that documents are not being provided to the public. He wanted to clarify about an administrative draft of an EIR for a development on the skyline site, and that was never released as a public document. It had not been reviewed by staff, and was a first draft. Unless a document was reviewed and approved as a draft public document it will not be released for public review.

CITY STAFF DISCUSSION

Associate Planner Wilson asked for volunteers for Architectural Review for October 12. **Commissoner Sammut Vice-Chair Johnson & Commissioner Marshall** volunteered to attend.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Vice-Chair Johnson wanted to know the time frame of the Bart Project. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that it would be around Spring 2002. **Vice-Chair Johnson** also asked if there have been any studies on traffic on Skyline, 280 or 380. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated that there is a congestion management plan done on all highways. **Vice-Chair Johnson** stated that there isn't any direct access from 280 or 380 to Skyline. **Associate Planner Padovan** stated this may not be a priority for the Transportation Authority to improve this road.

Motion Johnson/Second Marshall to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

George Foscardo
Secretary to the Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

Terry Birt, Chairperson
Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

NEXT MEETING: September 19, 2000

GF/ts